DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 838 HE 030 629

AUTHOR	Mohrman, Kathryn; Amadeo, Jo-Ann
TITLE	Perspectives on the Current Status of and Emerging Policy Issues for Liberal Arts Colleges. AGB Occasional Paper No. 10.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1991-00-00
NOTE	42p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 (members, $4.95; nonmembers, $9.95; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Environment; College Faculty; College Planning; Cultural Pluralism; Diversity (Faculty); Educational Trends; Faculty Recruitment; Financial Support; Futures (of Society); Governance; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; *Liberal Arts; Long Range Planning; *Small Colleges; Strategic Planning; Student Recruitment; Trend Analysis; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the issues facing trustees of liberal arts colleges, including such external challenges as ideological criticism, college costs, national economic trends, and competition from other types of institutions. Trustees are urged to address such issues as external criticism of the institution, concerns of students and parents about value received for money paid, and recent critiques of higher education in general. Other trends seen to undermine the distinctive qualities of these colleges include the role of faculty scholarship, student demand for more professionally-oriented undergraduate programs, and cultural pluralism. Suggested areas for trustees to address include: (1) the college's priorities; (2) the roles of research and scholarship within the college; (3) criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit pay; (4) expected faculty departures in the next five years; (5) faculty recruitment strategy; (6) percent of the faculty that are female or persons of color; and (7) consideration of program changes in coordination with faculty turnover. Finally, trustees are encouraged to focus on the students of the future, the financial future of liberal arts colleges, and the role of trustees in governance. Supporting data are shown in 11 tables. (Contains 16 references.) (BF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 838

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

Perspectives on the Current Status of and Emerging Policy Issues for Liberal Arts Colleges

By Kathryn Mohrman
with assistance from Jo-Ann Amadeo

AGB OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 10

HE 030 629

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges publishes the Occasional Paper Series as a service to its members. Each paper focuses on current and emerging issues and trends of concern to boards and administrators in the context of their institutional settings and addresses the responsibilities of the institution's leaders and policy makers. AGB distributes new titles in the Occasional Paper Series as they are published to chief executives and board chairs of member institutions.

Permission is granted to AGB members only to photocopy all or part of each paper provided proper credit appears on each copy. Individually bound copies are available at a nominal charge by calling 1-800/356-6317 or 202/296-8400 or by writing to AGB. Multiple-copy discounts are available.

Copyright 1991 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036. All rights reserved.

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle • Suite 400
Washington D C 20036

SUMMARY

Liberal arts colleges are a uniquely American form of higher education that emphasize the importance of teaching and the centrality of the liberal arts and sciences. These colleges create intellectual communities with experienced inquirers (the faculty) working closely with new colleagues (the students) to address critical questions of the natural world and the human condition. Students and faculty interact in classrooms and laboratories, at lectures and concerts, at the coffee house and in hallways, more frequently at liberal arts colleges than in other kinds of colleges and universities.

In this paper I raise questions for trustees around different issues that I believe will be critical for liberal arts colleges in the 1990s. The topics range from the external environment and issues of mission to the increased competition for both faculty and students, the financial situation, and the implications of all this for governance.

I return regularly to three themes--identity, integration, and community. College that know who they are (and what they are not) have a clear sense of identity that will contribute to success. Second, I believe that liberal arts colleges are especially well suited to provide students with intellectually and social integrated experiences. The sense of community is the third idea of a liberal arts college.

The **external environment** poses challenges ranging from ideological criticism to growing concern about college costs; trustees may become more involved in the issues and the defense of their institutions as they have not been recently. Questions:

- *Has your institution experienced criticism of its curriculum and programs by persons off the campus? How has the board reacted?*
- *How do you answer questions from students and parents about value received for money paid?*
- *Are you as an individual trustee knowledgeable about recent critiques of higher education?*

I believe that a clear sense of **mission** will distinguish successful institutions in the 1990s. Liberal arts colleges have a distinctiveness that sets them apart from other types of higher educational institutions, but that special character also means more difficulty in recruiting students and faculty who understand that mission. Trustees have a responsibility for giving attention to fundamental values and reminding the college what it is--and what it is not. Questions:

- *What are the priorities of your college? How is the mission different from that of Wheaton, Carleton, Swarthmore, and Occidental--or Michigan, UCLA, and Stanford?*
- *What are the roles of research and scholarship on your campus?*
- *What are the criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit pay?*

After years in which the supply of PhDs exceeded the new positions available on college and university campuses, we are entering an **era of faculty scarcity** in higher education. Demand for new professors in arts and sciences disciplines are especially high for liberal arts colleges just at the time that projections suggest only seven applicants for every ten positions. Colleges must renew their commitment to both recruitment and retention if they are to be successful in the coming decades. Questions:

- *How many professors at your college will be retiring or leaving in the next five years? ten years?*
- *What is the recruitment strategy on your campus?*
- *How many of your faculty are women and persons of color? Are you satisfied with those numbers?*
- *Are your administrators considering program changes in coordination with turnover in faculty?*

Competition for students will be critical in the 1990s. The increasing racial and cultural diversity of the American population (and thus of the student body) means that colleges need to rethink admissions criteria, curriculum, and student services. Institutions have the opportunity of strengthening their academic programs with new content and perspectives at the same time that they embrace greater diversity in the community. Questions:

- *How satisfied are your students with your college?*
- *What is the demographic profile of your applicant pool? your student body?*
- *What are the academic and career interests of the undergraduates on your campus?*
- *Are your faculty and administrators discussing the relationship between changes in the student body and changes in curriculum and student services?*
- *How does your college define itself as a community? Will that change as student characteristics change?*

The financial conditions of many liberal arts colleges improved during the 1980s, but prospects for continued growth in the 1990s are uncertain. The investment of institutional resources in financial aid has increased dramatically in the last 20 years; the commitment to student diversity suggests greater, not reduced, investments in the future. In general trustees will be required to look even more carefully than before at the relationship between expenditures and mission. Questions:

- *Does your campus have a planning process that considers the impact of changes in the external economic environment?*
- *What is your campus policy on student financial aid? Will it need to change in the 1990s?*
- *Where have expenditures increased most rapidly in recent years on your campus? Are these expenditures related directly to institutional mission?*

The issues I raise in this paper have real implications for governance. If even some of my projections are accurate, service as a trustee may be more difficult in the 1990s than it was in the previous decade. Governing boards will have to look at themselves, as well as their institutions, more critically. Questions:

- *Do you and your fellow board members understand the issues facing your institution?*
- *Do you spend time at board meetings discussing broad issues of mission and policy?*
- *What forms of accountability do you have in place—and will you need in the future?*
- *Does the current membership of the board have expertise in the areas of greatest importance to the college?*
- *Do the programs and services of the college relate to the institutional mission?*

Liberal arts colleges are a uniquely American form of higher education that concentrate their energies on the education of undergraduates. Often growing out of a religious tradition, these colleges enroll bright young men and women to spend four years in a residential community studying the liberal arts and sciences. In many ways, liberal arts colleges represent the American ideal of an undergraduate education. The Gothic towers and grassy courtyards of liberal arts colleges are familiar scenes in movies and books that extol collegiate life. This image of the undergraduate experience, however, is reality for only 4.7 percent of U.S. undergraduates; almost all American students attend other institutions, from land-grant universities to community colleges, that do not resemble the liberal arts college.

The ivy-covered college, often in a small-town setting, serves as a paradigm in part because of its success. At their best, these institutions create intellectual communities with experienced inquirers (the faculty) working closely with new colleagues (the students) to address critical questions of the natural world and the human condition. In addition, students and faculty interact in classrooms and laboratories, at lectures and concerts, at the coffee house and in hallways more frequently than in other segments of higher education. Studies of student achievement, faculty satisfaction, and educational impact all cite the small residential college as an effective form of undergraduate education. In addition, the liberal arts college may well be in the best position to weather the changes in American society and in higher education in the years ahead.

I focus in this paper on institutions closest to the traditional model of the liberal arts college. The Carnegie Foundation, in its classification of all institutions of higher education, has defined Liberal Arts Colleges I as predominantly undergraduate institutions awarding more than half of their degrees in the arts and sciences, while Liberal Arts Colleges II are those awarding less than half of their degrees in those subjects (but are too small to be considered

for the Comprehensive category). In the Carnegie classification, 142 institutions are Liberal Arts Colleges I and 430 institutions are Liberal Arts Colleges II (see Table I in the Appendix to this paper). Recent analysts of higher education, including David Breneman, believe that the list of "true" liberal arts colleges is even smaller and shrinking. While much of what follows applies to other undergraduate colleges (and indeed at times to all segments of higher education), I concentrate on Liberal Arts I institutions, including such familiar names as Williams, Scripps, Morehouse, St. Olaf, Franklin and Marshall, Oberlin, Fisk, Hollins, Whitman, Grinnell, Wellesley, Birmingham Southern, Dickinson, Furman, Middlebury, and Sweet Briar.

Let me state some of my passions and prejudices at the outset. As a graduate and trustee of one of these colleges, I obviously value their emphasis on good teaching and their focus on the liberal arts and sciences. They have a competitive advantage, I believe, in their concentration upon undergraduate education on a small scale, but this special character may be threatened by both external and internal forces.

On the outside, public research universities are intensifying their efforts to improve undergraduate programs, thus competing with liberal arts colleges on both price and quality dimensions. (Since I am personally involved in that effort at a flagship public university, I know how hard research universities are competing.) National economic trends are disadvantageous for all of higher education, but the small scale of liberal arts colleges, plus their heavy investment in student services and other "luxuries," make them especially vulnerable. A third external force is conservative criticism, not only of student behavior, but of curriculum decisions of the faculty.

Internal trends also have the potential to undermine the distinctive qualities of liberal arts colleges. In one section of this paper I discuss the growth of the "research college," in essence a discussion of the role of faculty scholarship on predominantly teaching campuses. While we all want faculty to be intellectually alive, and thus to be active scholars in some way,

It would be grave mistake to liberal arts colleges blindly to adopt the "publish or perish" syndrome of some research universities. I have seen too many of the disadvantages of this model to be its naive advocate.

A second internal force is student demand for more professionally-oriented undergraduate programs. These legitimate needs must be addressed by higher education, but liberal arts colleges should be conscious of what they are giving up if they accept new missions. The third internal force is that of cultural pluralism. The ways in which institutions recruit faculty, structure their curricula, and organize student services for an increasingly diverse student body will determine in large part their success in the coming years.

In the pages that follow I return regularly to three themes: identity, integration, and community. Colleges that know who they are—and equally important, what they are not—have a clear sense of identity that will contribute to their success. Second, I believe that liberal arts colleges are especially well suited to provide students with an intellectually and socially integrated experience. The curriculum can be more than a smorgasbord of academic offerings; the residential nature of the campus can link classroom and extra-curricular experiences; the small size can encourage interaction among students, faculty, and staff. A sense of community is a third theme for liberal arts colleges. Education should be more than a private act or an opportunity for personal development; at its best, college means membership in a community of scholars addressing important social and intellectual questions.

A final word of introduction. I am mindful of the danger of superficiality in a paper with mandates for both brevity and coverage of issues from curriculum to finance; I also know that trustees vary widely in their knowledge of issues in higher education. Any one of the topics I raise deserves a whole paper to explore its complexities. Obviously I can only introduce issues for further consideration, so I pose questions at the beginning of each section of the paper. While the questions are implicit recommendations, I recognize the diversity of

responses among liberal arts colleges. Questions of multi-cultural community, for example, will have very different answers on rural midwestern campuses compared with historically black colleges; the size of the endowment governs an institution's generosity with financial aid. Similarly, issues of faculty recruitment are more pressing on a campus with a high percentage of imminent retirements than one with many young faculty. But I believe firmly that every governing board needs to address these questions in the context of its own mission and circumstances.

THE ENVIRONMENT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 1990s

Questions for trustees:

- *Has your institution experienced criticism of its curriculum and programs by persons off the campus? How has the board reacted?*
- *How do you answer questions from students and parents about value received for money paid?*
- *Are you as an individual trustee knowledgeable about recent critiques of higher education?*

In the last decade, American higher education has been criticized in ways that had not occurred earlier, and colleges and universities now must deal with this erosion of public respect. While Americans have always wondered what professors really do, or lamented student indiscretions as they lived away from home for the first time, or worried about how much undergraduates were really learning in college, more recent criticisms strike deeper at fundamental issues of higher education. Books such as *Profscam* suggest that faculty are cynically ripping off their employers by doing as little as possible, while Justice Department investigations of alleged price fixing by more than 50 private colleges and universities imply that these institutions are cynically ripping off students and their parents through artificially high prices.

Families seem less and less willing to tolerate annual tuition increases at a time when real family incomes have been stable or declining, even as colleges struggle to keep changes as low as possible. Whether protesting the "sticker shock" of a $15,000 or $18,000 bill at a private institution or a 10 percent tuition rise at a public university, students and parents are rebelling at cost increases that regularly outstrip the national inflation rate. Colleges and universities have been ineffective in arguing that the Consumer Price Index does not reflect accurately the categories of expenses faced by higher education, or that the long-term benefits of college justify regularly increasing tuitions. This concern about cost may be one explanation for the increasing appeal of public institutions with their state-subsidized prices.

Perhaps the most damaging criticism, however, has been the ideological attack on higher education. The recent debate over the reading list for Stanford's western civilization sequence is the most public instance but the conversation is much broader. In an effort to address both current intellectual developments and the changing composition of their student bodies, many colleges and universities have broadened their curricula to include new theories of deconstruction, to incorporate feminist scholarship, and often to require study of ethnicity or non-Western cultures. Curriculum change will always be a subject of debate, but charges of indoctrination and abandonment of American values have politicized the discussion far beyond the usual faculty deliberations of course content. Editorials on both sides of the issue regularly appear in the *Wall Street Journal* and the *New York Times*; persons inside and outside the academy describe the tyranny of "political correctness"; and government officials from members of Congress to Cabinet secretaries frequently excoriate colleges and universities (*Tyrannical Machines*, the report by National Endowment for the Humanities chair, Lynn Cheney, is only the most recent example). As critics of society, intellectuals must be prepared to accept as well as to exercise criticism, but the ferocity of the debate has left many Americans wondering about the value of higher education at all. As a result, trustees may

find themselves defending their institutions from new types of criticism; not only will they be asked to deal with the inevitable misbehavior of young adults but also with attacks on intellectual freedom or institutional decisions on curriculum. Presidents may need much more support from their boards if they are to uphold their college's missions and autonomy.

Trustees are in a strong position to go beyond the defense of their own campuses to articulate the public value of liberal arts colleges. Their autonomy is a counterbalance to a state-funded system; their quality is a model for all of higher education; their record in producing national leaders over the years is remarkable. At the same time that we need to listen more attentively to public criticisms, we also need to speak more articulately of the public mission of private institutions. Thus, while Americans are increasingly critical of colleges and universities these days, they also continue to support higher education by their own actions. Just as voters demand that we "throw the rascals out" yet re-elect their own members of Congress more than 95 percent of the time, so citizens criticize colleges and universities collectively but seek their services individually in record numbers. In addition, both alumni giving and corporate contributions to higher education reach new levels each year. Small colleges in particular are valued in their communities as cultural and economic assets, and applications to leading liberal arts colleges outstrip available spaces by ratios of 5 or 6 to 1. While the decline of American higher education has been regularly predicted, it need not come to pass if presidents and trustees act with courage in the difficult environment predicted for the coming years.

ISSUES OF MISSION

Questions for trustees:

- *What are the priorities of your college? How is the mission different from that of Wheaton, Carleton, Swarthmore, and Occidental--or Michigan, UCLA, and Stanford?*
- *What are the roles of research and scholarship on your campus?*
- *What are the criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit pay?*

The richness of the private sector of American higher education derives largely from the distinctiveness of the missions of these campuses, yet some institutions seem to lose sight of what distinguishes them from other campuses. In a decade in which public criticism will probably be rising, each college will need to be self-conscious about its mission and the way in which its fundamental values are translated into programs, strategies, and financial priorities. A college that is interchangeable with the institution down the street or across the state may not have the distinctiveness to be successful in difficult times.

Some observers fear that the distinctiveness of liberal arts colleges is being challenged by the growth of the "research college" model. The appropriate balance between teaching and research is a constant subject of debate on all types of campuses, but it is relatively new to those colleges in which teaching has always been the predominant mission. Increasingly, however, liberal arts colleges are raising their expectations for scholarship by their faculty members, while new young professors in particular are asking for more research support and for more opportunities to develop professional reputations in their disciplines. Teaching loads are often reduced as colleges seek to compete for faculty with peer institutions or larger universities.

Why is this happening? After all, professors at undergraduate institutions have been involved in research for decades. The term "research college" received increased attention in the mid-1980s when elite liberal arts colleges sought to make a case to the National Science

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foundation for funding for science facilities, but the pressures come from other sources as well. Young professors, worried about their careers, know that research may provide opportunities for mobility because publications have national audiences, while quality teaching generates only local currency. In this context, the phrase "community of scholars" means the international network of organic chemists or continental philosophers, not the institution at which faculty members are physically located. Also, observers have commented upon the growing homogeneity of all of American higher education, increasingly dominated by the monolithic paradigm of the research university with its emphasis on the development of new knowledge and demonstration of it through publication. Using this analysis, critics of the research college argue that first-rate teaching colleges are becoming third-rate universities.

I believe there are several ways out of this trap. The first is to define research more broadly than activities leading to articles in scholarly journals. Ernest Boyer, in a new book entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered*, calls for a more inclusive definition of scholarship and a reward system for faculty that acknowledges this fuller vision. Boyer proposes that scholarship should have four components: the discovery of knowledge; the integration of knowledge; the application of knowledge; and the transmission of knowledge through teaching.

The scholarship of discovery comes closest to what is traditionally meant as academic research. By the scholarship of integration, Boyer emphasizes making connections across the disciplines and placing specialties in larger context. This approach to scholarship can be especially fruitful at liberal arts colleges where small size bring faculty from different disciplines into physical and intellectual proximity. The goals of liberal arts education naturally lead to concern for breadth of perspective; curricular responses often include interdisciplinary courses and capstone seminars. In addition, integrative scholarship is consistent with national intellectual trends that cross traditional disciplinary boundaries. Boyer quotes the

anthropologist Clifford Geertz as saying that "what we are seeing is not just another redrawing of the cultural map... but an alteration of the principles of mapping. Something is happening to the way we think about the way we think." Attention to the integration of knowledge can place scholars at liberal arts colleges at the center of intellectual ferment today.

Boyer's third category, the scholarship of application, calls for attention to social problems. While land-grant universities represent the category most often linked to applied research, many liberal arts colleges also have a tradition of service and thereby can contribute to the application of knowledge. It is the fourth category, however, the scholarship of teaching, that relates more directly to liberal arts colleges. Boyer describes the challenges of teaching with these words:

> Teaching is a dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning.... Great teachers create a common ground of intellectual commitment. They stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers....Teaching at its best means not only transmitting knowledge, but *transforming* and *extending* it as well. Through reading, through classroom discussion, and surely through comments and questions posed by students, professors themselves will be pushed in creative new directions.

Boyer makes a strong case for teaching as a form of scholarship, but I believe the concept can be extended further than he takes it. Psychologists and cognitive scientists are developing new theories about the ways in which people learn, while many national disciplinary associations are giving renewed attention to the teaching of such subjects as history, sociology, and physics. Systematic work on the pedagogy of one's discipline is as intellectually rigorous as the discovery of new knowledge; translation of those pedagogical insights into new syllabi, computer programs, and textbooks is a form of scholarship especially appropriate for faculty at institutions devoted to undergraduate education. In sum, Boyer's broad definition of four kinds of scholarship provides a constructive approach to research in liberal arts colleges without mindlessly imitating the university.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A second way to avoid the potential pitfalls of the research college model is to make scholarship more public and less private. At colleges where teaching expectations are substantial, research usually happens during summers and sabbaticals when faculty can leave campus or retreat into their labs. In addition, when faculty are the sole representatives of their specialties on campus, they tend to look for intellectual colleagues in their disciplines at other institutions; as a consequence, they are likely to reduce their involvement in advising, governance, and campus events. In this scenario, the traditional approach to research can undermine the goal of building community.

Scholarship more firmly embedded in the institution, however, can contribute to the fundamental values of the college. Integrative work that results in interdisciplinary courses or joint projects encourages faculty to develop colleagues on their own campuses rather than with the economists or biologists at other places. Support for undergraduate research links students and faculty in common inquiry--and incidentally often produces published papers. Faculty seminars, reading groups, and "work-in-progress" presentations make individual scholarship more of a collective endeavor. When professors return from sabbatical, they should be expected to share their new insights with others on campus. I believe that one of the hallmarks of a good liberal arts college is its quality as a community of scholars; institutional policies on promotion, tenure and merit pay, plus informal campus expectations, should reward actions that contribute to community rather than those that unintentionally undercut collective goals.

Discussion of the role of research returns to consideration of the fundamentals of the institution. The question is not "Should liberal arts faculty engage in research?" but rather "For what reasons is scholarship important at liberal arts colleges?" The goal is the intellectual growth of faculty members and their students, not merely research for its own sake. If the first priority of the college is teaching, and publication and other forms of

scholarship contribute to that goal, then the mission of the campus can be enhanced not diminished by research.

The focus on fundamental values also avoids a dangerous irony. The growing attention to scholarship in liberal arts colleges comes at a time when large universities are renewing their interest in undergraduate education. If public institutions are able to persuade students that they provide strong undergraduate programs in a research setting, and also charge lower tuition, they may be able to attract students on the basis of both quality and price. Liberal arts colleges may face the possibility of losing their comparative advantage of excellent teaching and attention to students as individuals. It would be a great contradiction--and a great loss--if liberal arts colleges seek to be more like research universities at the same time that those universities recapture the values of a liberal arts education.

Liberal arts colleges work hard to explain their special qualities to prospective students, but increasingly they must also be more persuasive to prospective faculty about the opportunities they provide for both teaching and scholarship. The quality of life offered by the best colleges match well with what many faculty say they want in their careers; with a changing labor market for academics, institutions will need to become more aggressive in explaining their virtues to faculty.

THE NEW COMPETITION FOR COLLEGE FACULTY

Questions for trustees:

- *How many professors at your college will be retiring or leaving in the next five years? ten years?*
- *What is the recruitment strategy on your campus?*
- *How many of your faculty are women and persons of color? Are you satisfied with those numbers?*

- *Are your administrators considering program changes in coordination with turnover in faculty?*

After more than a decade in which the supply of PhDs far outstripped the number of available academic positions, higher education is entering an era in which colleges and universities will have increasing difficulty finding qualified candidates in arts and sciences disciplines. William Bowen and Julie Ann Sosa project that Liberal Arts Colleges I will need new faculty at a rate higher than that for any other sector of higher education (Table II). When they combine this demand with the decline in the number of arts and sciences PhDs being produced, Bowen and Sosa conclude:

> And if competition for faculty in general becomes acute, as may well happen in 1997-2002, the competition for faculty who hold doctorates from the most prestigious universities is sure to become even more intense. In such circumstances, many of the strongest Liberal Arts I institutions, for example, could find it very hard to continue to recruit faculty members from the universities that have educated a large number of their current staff (p.143).

As colleges and universities search for new professors, they are looking not only at academic quality but often for women and persons of color to increase the diversity of the faculty. Here the statistics are bleak indeed. Table III shows the small proportion of current faculty who are non-white; projections of the supply of new PhDs of color in the pipeline are tiny--and declining in many fields. While individual minority professors may benefit from increased competition for their talents, higher education as a whole will be better served by increasing the size and diversity of the faculty pool rather than engaging in a game of musical chairs in which the few African American and Latino and Native American faculty move from campus to campus lured by ever more attractive offers.

Liberal arts colleges may also find themselves the targets of recruitment raids from larger universities looking for experienced faculty with a combination of scholarly productivity and proven teaching ability. This possibility may be another reason for thinking carefully

about the role of scholarship in liberal arts colleges; competing on the same terms as research universities may leave colleges the perennial losers. Thus the demand figures shown in the appendix could be even greater if campuses cannot retain the good faculty they recruit.

But the picture is not completely bleak. Surveys of faculty demonstrate that many college professors today desire the qualities that liberal arts college provide. Liberal arts faculty are the most satisfied, when compared with faculty at other types of colleges and universities, with their choice of an academic career (Table IV). One reason for this result may be the congruence of faculty values with the mission of liberal arts colleges. For example, 53 percent of faculty surveyed in 1984 agreed with the statement, "Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education." In the same survey, the majority of professors, even at doctorate-granting and comprehensive universities and colleges, agreed with the statement, "My interests lie toward teaching as opposed to research" (Table V). More than half of all liberal arts faculty, in assessing their own institutions, believe "It is a very good place for me" (Table VI). Other reasons for job satisfaction which liberal arts faculty rank high include institutional philosophy, spirit of cooperation among faculty, quality of faculty and administrative leadership, support services available, and good relationships between administrators and faculty (Table VII). These findings suggest the compelling power of intrinsic rewards of the academic life. As Burton Clark notes, faculty members have a strong belief in education as the best hope for improvement of the human condition, a sustaining goal that overshadows the small financial rewards and other frustrations of professorial life.

These statistics suggest that liberal arts colleges need to market the value of these unique institutions to prospective faculty just as much as they do to prospective students. Quality-of-life issues are important to new professors and liberal arts colleges can provide an

intellectual and personal sense of community that other institutions cannot. Historically, liberal arts colleges have encouraged high proportions of their students to pursue PhDs and thus have served as an important source of the next generation of college professors; candidates who attended liberal arts colleges themselves both understand the special quality of these institutions and appreciate the expectations of being faculty members on such campuses. But recently, research universities have surpassed liberal arts colleges as undergraduate sources of PhDs, so colleges will need to work harder to sell the values of the liberal arts in the hiring market.

Many liberal arts colleges are developing programs to encourage their current students to attend graduate school and enter the professoriate. "Grow your own" is an important strategy for addressing the supply side of the equation and thus making the Bowen and Sosa projections more favorable for liberal arts colleges. Such actions are particularly important for students of color; if we cannot increase the diversity of the applicant pool, we will never have the kind of faculty profile we want in our institutions. The projections of the composition of student bodies at liberal arts colleges makes this recruitment strategy more feasible and also more critical in the coming years.

THE STUDENTS OF THE FUTURE

Questions for trustees:

- *How satisfied are your students with your college?*
- *What is the demographic profile of your applicant pool? your student body?*
- *What are the academic and career interests of the undergraduates on your campus?*
- *Are your faculty and administrators discussing the relationship between changes in the student body and changes in curriculum and student services?*
- *How does your college define itself as a community? Will that change as student characteristics change?*

Liberal arts colleges rate high levels of student satisfaction. In a national survey of undergraduates, students at liberal arts colleges gave more positive answers to questions about teaching and intellectual endeavors than those at other types of higher educational institutions (Table VIII). A longitudinal study by Alexander Astin of more than 200,000 students finds that the greatest positive impact occurs at small, private, residential colleges–whether the factor is student satisfaction, academic achievement, self-concept, or campus involvement.

But liberal arts colleges appeal to the "rare" student–primarily the recent high school graduate with an interest in the arts and sciences and with a willingness to delay specifically vocational training until after graduation. Such students traditionally have come from solidly middle-class homes in which the parents have college educations; most often they are white.

But these students represent a diminishing share of the college-going population today. When freshmen nationwide are asked about their probable field of study, fewer than one-quarter of them indicate an interest in majoring in the liberal arts and sciences (Table IX). Even at private four-year colleges, the number is only about one-third of all entering students. But whatever their preferences, fewer of the students of the future are likely to be white (Tables X and XI). Liberal arts colleges, along with other types of colleges and universities, have worked hard to recruit African American, Latino, and Asian American students to their ranks, but they have discovered that the few students of color with high SAT scores and grade point averages are pursued avidly by many institutions. If colleges and universities have any hopes of developing a student body representative of the nation's racial and ethnic makeup, they must look beyond those minority students who have traditional entrance qualifications and instead use other measures of talent.

Traditionally, colleges concerned about diversity have focused on quantitative measures of recruitment, access, equity, retention, and preparation in elementary and

secondary schools. I believe the colleges today must ask more difficult qualitative questions: Access to what? Is it appropriate for today's students--of whatever color--to study the same curriculum as their older sisters and brothers? Will students of various cultural backgrounds be successful if their cultural groups are not represented in the curriculum?

There is no easy answer to such questions, nor is there a single correct answer for all institutions; one of the glories of liberal arts colleges is their freedom to arrive at different conclusions based on their different missions. Spelman will continue proudly to serve African American women, St. John's will continue its Great Books curriculum, and neither should be expected to answer important questions of purpose in the same way. But it is vital that faculty, students, administrators, and trustees wrestle with difficult questions about the future of the institution. The differences in answers, however, should not hide the importance of the discussion, for liberal arts colleges cannot afford to duck basic questions of mission, student composition, and curriculum at a time when American society is changing rapidly.

On most campuses, the admission of students from a wider variety of cultural backgrounds and ages will not be successful without changes in curriculum and student services. Even if the composition of the student body remained unchanged, colleges will need to include the perspectives of women, Asian and African societies, and American ethnic groups in the curriculum. Today's undergraduates will enter a work in which no single ethnic or racial group is likely to be in the majority; our colleges have an obligation to prepare them for that world. Thus the curriculum for all students must include both the western tradition and a broader sense of cultural difference, even if the mission of the institution is service to a particular religious or ethnic group.

The response to date on many campuses is a "mix and stir" approach--add a little black history here, add a woman author there--to a largely unchanged curriculum. Instead, I believe the full incorporation of diversity should mean intellectual participation in a redefinition

of American society that places questions of culture, gender, and ethnicity at the center rather than the periphery of the curriculum. A commitment to academic excellence also means rigorous efforts to eliminate distortions because of lack of objectivity, bias in language, faulty causal theory, or failure to recognize alternate paradigms. These distortions are often the result of too narrow a scope of inquiry, so the incorporation of perspectives of many cultural groups can lead to stronger academic programs by broadening the intellectual agenda. In this view, the inclusion of students and faculty from a variety of backgrounds is more than social engineering; it is the means to significant improvements in teaching and scholarship in many disciplines. The aggregation of these changes will result in a new curriculum that is truly multi-cultural and intellectually advanced in substantive ways.

The effort to embrace these changes in American society, and changes in the student body, leads to a dilemma that is especially difficult for liberal arts colleges. A multi-cultural curriculum requires not only retraining of existing faculty and the hiring of new professors, but a much broader definition of what can be taught, yet a small college with one hundred professors cannot begin to provide coverage of all the issues and areas of interest. Can a single campus afford both Chicano studies and Southeast Asian studies? Is the college cheating its students if it does not offer Arabic language and courses on the Middle East? Should the institution teach Chinese as well as Japanese? Should a course on immigration history replace one on the Jacksonian era?

If liberal arts colleges cannot provide the breadth of subject matter than larger universities do, then they must find another organizing principle for dealing with issues of diversity. The options tend to favor integration over full representation. One possibility is to focus on the definition of culture; in this construct students and faculty alike would develop the tools to think critically about questions of difference. Another approach would be the model of contrast, in which students and faculty probe deeply into several cultures other than their own.

In either example, the college need not offer courses in every ethnic group or world area, yet would be providing a more diverse curriculum that prepares students for a changing world. The coming years will see a variety of responses as institutions wrestle with these issues in the context of their individual missions.

In addition to implications for curriculum, the increasing diversity of the student body of the future may also lead to greater politicization of the campus. In the 1980s, many colleges and universities experienced incidences of intolerance or violence against women, racial groups, gays and lesbians, and other segments of the student population. Just as our national political system is increasingly organized around single issue politics, so many campuses are fraught with special interest groups organized around student identities.

Special interest politics on campus raise difficult questions. Does every student group require a special center or counselor? Many campuses now have, or are being asked to create, physical locations and professional staff positions to represent the institution's recognition of Latino students or gay and lesbian students in much the same way that black students' dorms or centers were demanded in the 1960s. The reasons behind these requests are obvious, but just as colleges may not be able to afford an additive curriculum, they may not want infinitely expanding student services. As I suggested earlier, colleges might take a focused approach to questions of culture and difference rather than study many different ethnic groups separately, so student services could give in-depth attention to the tensions and opportunities of life on an increasingly diverse campus.

A second question for campuses is the meaning of community, that hallmark of the liberal arts college, if the campus is fragmented into many special interest groups. The question is especially problematic if faculty are increasingly less engaged in the out-of-classroom life of the institution, whether because of two-career families, increased involvement in research, or changing norms of professorial life. The intellectual and personal development

of students that is the goal of the liberal arts college requires the engagement of adults–especially faculty–in the critical questions of the day. There are few more important issues facing the next generation of leaders than such queries as: What is community? What is the responsibility of the citizen to the polity? What is the meaning of ethnic (or gender or racial or sexual) difference? How can a community appropriately recognize these differences without splintering? How can individuals maintain their separate identities and also be part of a larger entity? In addressing these questions, colleges will not have a comfortable existence, but they will be preparing their students for life in the larger society.

Many campuses are increasingly diverse in visible ways, but fewer are successful at socio-economic diversity. The daughter of a successful Latino doctor in the Chicago suburbs certainly contributes to the cultural breadth of her college, but she may have more in common with traditional WASP students than would the daughter of a coal miner from the mountains of Pennsylvania or the son of a struggling family farmer in Alabama. By definition, students from the least affluent strata of American society will require substantial financial aid to meet high comprehensive fees, so greater class diversity carries a price tag at least as large as the increased costs of diversity in curriculum and student services. This tension between educational philosophy and fiscal reality is at the center of many debates at liberal arts colleges today.

THE FINANCIAL FUTURE OF LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Questions for trustees:

- *Does your campus have a planning process that considers the impact of changes in the external economic environment?*
- *What is your campus policy on student financial aid? Will it need to change in the 1990s?*
- *Where have expenditures increased most rapidly in recent years on your campus? Are these expenditures related directly to institutional mission?*

In retrospect the 1980s were very good years for higher education. The demographic drought did not materialize, the stock market produced bigger endowments, philanthropic donations to colleges and universities reached new highs, the National Science Foundation and other federal agencies increased the proportion of their budgets for undergraduate education and research, and students and families continued to apply to private institutions. As a result, liberal arts colleges (and all of higher education) collectively were better off in fiscal terms at the end of the 1980s than they were a decade earlier.

Howard Bowen, noted economist of higher education, characterized the behavior of colleges and universities with this often-quoted description: "Each institution raises all the money it can; each institution spends all it raises." Liberal arts colleges in particular invested in the 1980s in quality improvements in computerization, faculty size and salaries, physical plant, student services, and admission offices. Campuses also dedicated more and more of their own funds to maintain their traditional levels of financial aid and to increase their support of previously under-represented groups. Higher education is not an industry that typically uses its "profits" to reduce costs, increase its customer base, decrease labor costs with improvements in technology, or respond to customer demand for certain types of products. As Richard Spies points out in a chapter in *Higher Education in a Changing Economy*, colleges and universities are driven by complexity and quality in ways that profit-making businesses are not.

The 1990s are unlikely to mimic the 1980s financially. The nation's economy will probably enter a recession; endowments will not grow dramatically unless fueled by fortuitous bequests or venture capital "hits"; federal and state governments will have few new revenues to direct toward higher education; public pressures will keep tuition increases lower; corporations and foundations seem to be directing their educational gifts increasingly to the

elementary and secondary levels. Even if all the trends do not turn negative, institutions must plan for a slow growth environment at best.

Student financial aid is a particular concern. Independent institutions of all types now provide more scholarship and grant assistance to undergraduates than all federal grants combined to students at these same schools. In 1987-88, liberal arts colleges used their own resources to provide an average financial aid award of $3426 to 61 percent of their total student bodies (Table XII). Institutionally provided student aid now represents 16 percent of the education and general expenditures of liberal arts colleges, up from 11 percent in 1970. Trustees concerned about scarce financial resources should be sobered by the fact that 65 percent of these funds come from tuition and other revenues rather than the endowments that are traditionally thought of as sources for scholarship funds.

So the 1990s may be a decade in which program improvements are more likely to be funded by trade-offs within the existing budget rather than additions to it. Faculty, students, administrators, and trustees will be asking with increasing frequency: What is critical? What are essential activities in terms of institutional mission? What is the payoff for the marginal dollar? Trustees in particular must look at changes in their own budgets over the last few years to identify the areas in which expenditures have increased most rapidly, and then to identify the value added for students of these extra expenditures. If there is no significant quality improvement, then the particular area of expenditure is ripe for further investigation or retrenchment.

The financial circumstances of each college differ dramatically, so no general essay can provide all the questions, much less their answers. The prospect of tight budgets in the coming years, however, means that trustees will have to work much harder in the 1990s to exercise their fiduciary responsibilities to their institutions.

IMPLICATIONS FOR GOVERNANCE

Questions for trustees:

- *Do you and your fellow board members understand the issues facing your institution?*
- *Do you spend time at board meetings discussing broad issues of mission and policy?*
- *What forms of accountability do you have in place--and will you need in the future?*
- *Does the current membership of the board have expertise in the areas of greatest importance to the college?*
- *Do the programs and services of the college relate to the institutional mission?*

Liberal arts colleges are wonderful institutions. Their traditions, their quality, their emphasis on undergraduates brought increased popularity during the 1980s when some observers were predicting their downfall. They are among the institutions of higher education least affected by transitory changes in the broader environment, yet are resilient and responsive to social trends. I consider it a real honor to be a member of the governing board of one of these colleges.

But the job of trustee in the 1990s may be more difficult than in the previous decade. Even if only a few of my projections are accurate, trustees will need to understand their institutions in more detail than they have in the past. Limited budgets mean that we will have to ask administrators and faculty--and ourselves--to wrestle with tough decisions on financial trade-offs. While the curriculum is clearly the province of the faculty, not the trustees, we should insist that important questions of curriculum are being addressed in serious ways by the campus. If the college is torn apart by single issue politics, we will need to meet with students, to consult with faculty, to listen to administrators, and to support the president more frequently and more forcefully than we may have done in the past. If outside criticism of the college becomes a serious issue, we must understand the issues well so we can defend our institutions effectively.

One obvious trend in higher education is greater accountability, an area in which trustees must inevitably become involved. The federal government insists on time-and-effort reports and affirmative action guarantees from many institutions; local governments are demanding payments in lieu of taxes; courts are no longer treating colleges and universities as privileged entities in tenure and discrimination cases; arguments of educational self determination are less persuasive; state governments and citizens, not to mention students and families, are asking more pointedly about what is being delivered for the dollars being spent. "Trust us--we know best" is no longer an acceptable response by colleges and universities. As a result, trustees must be part of the decision-making process about how the campus will become more responsive and to whom it is willing to become more accountable.

Many of the issues I outline in this paper apply at the board level as well. The issue of student and faculty diversity mirrors the question of the composition of the board of trustees--how diverse a group is it with respect to age, gender, race, ethnicity, geography, occupation, religious affiliation? Decisions on effective use of institutional resources raises the question of how the board uses its own resources--how does it allocate the time in its meetings? What costs does the board engender for the college? Institutional accountability suggests that trustees collectively may be challenged for financial and other decisions. As trustees, we need to look carefully at ourselves at the same time that we scrutinize our campuses.

Management expert Peter Drucker is famous for his analysis of the decline of American railroads as a failure of knowing what business they were in. They thought they were in the railroad business when in fact they were in the transportation business; their inability to see the challenge of the trucking industry and other transportation providers contributed to their decline. In a similar vein, trustees of liberal arts colleges might do well to ask themselves what business--or businesses--our colleges are in. Are we in the knowledge transmission business? The graduate school preparation business? The character

development business? The community service business? The academic research business? The conservation of the Western tradition or a specific religious heritage? Leadership development? Attention to ethical and spiritual qualities? The formation of citizens? Application of sophisticated analytical skills to important social problems? How do we rank the relative priority of these different goals?

The answers obviously will vary from campus to campus, but the process is one of clarifying mission and fundamental values. Liberal arts colleges that know who they are--and perhaps equally important, what they are not--stand the best chance of thriving in the 1990s. A college should be able to tell prospective students, prospective faculty members, and the public at large what it represents and how it distinguishes itself from other seemingly similar institutions. If the job of the trustees is to assure the long-term welfare of the institution, then we have no more important task than guiding our colleges to agreement on a collective sense of purpose.

APPENDIX

TABLE I
Number of institutions and enrollments by classification of institutional type

	Number	Enrollment (1000s)	Percentage of total enrollmt
Research universities I	70	1,579	12.8
Research universities II	34	630	5.1
Doctorate-granting universities I	51	680	5.5
Doctorate-granting universities II	58	540	4.4
Comprehensive universities & colleges I	424	2,971	24.2
Comprehensive universities & colleges II	171	332	2.7
Liberal arts colleges I	142	214	1.7
Liberal arts colleges II	430	370	3.0
Two year colleges	1,367	4,518	36.7
Specialized institutions	642	467	3.8
TOTAL all institutions	3,389	12,301	

Source: *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Table 4

TABLE II

Changes in projected demand for arts and sciences faculty, by type of institution

	1987-92	1992-97	1997-2002	2002-07	2007-12
Research universities I	1.00	0.99	1.57	1.61	1.41
Other research/doctorate	1.00	1.16	1.87	1.90	1.65
Comprehensive I	1.00	1.24	2.06	2.13	1.84
Liberal arts I	1.00	1.30	2.17	2.22	1.95
Other four year	1.00	1.15	1.67	1.67	1.47
TOTAL all five sectors	1.00	1.13	1.82	1.86	1.62

Source: Bowen and Sosa, *Prospects for Faculty*, Table 7.7

TABLE III

Percentage distribution of full-time regular faculty, by race/ethnicity and gender, and type of institution, Fall 1987

	White %	Amer Indian %	Asian %	Black %	Hispanic %	Male %	Female %
Public research	90	1	5	2	2	79	21
Private research	85	0	4	6	5	81	19
Public doctoral	91	1	5	2	1	76	24
Private doctoral	86	<1	10	2	1	73	27
Public comprehensive	88	1	6	4	2	71	29
Private comprehensive	91	1	4	2	1	72	28
Liberal arts	87	1	3	8	1	71	29
Public two year	91	1	2	3	3	62	38
Other	95	0	1	3	1	79	21
TOTAL all institutions	89	1	4	3	2	73	27

Source: Russell, *Faculty in Higher Education*, Tables 2.3 and 2.5

TABLE IV
Satisfaction of faculty with choice of career

Question: "If I had it do it over again, I would not become a college teacher."

	Strongly Agree %	Agree with Reservations %	Disagree with Reservations %	Strongly Disagree %
Research univ I	5	13	27	55
Research univ II	6	15	24	55
Doctoral univ I	10	13	27	50
Doctoral univ II	8	13	24	55
Comprehensive C&U I	11	13	24	52
Comprehensive C&U II	9	14	23	54
Liberal arts I	4	9	28	59
Liberal arts II	7	20	25	48
Two year colleges	7	12	26	55
TOTAL all institutions	8	13	25	54

Source: Clark, *The Academic Life*, Table 13

TABLE V
Faculty attitudes toward teaching and research

Question: "My interests lie toward teaching as opposed to research."

	Percent Agreeing
Research university	39%
Doctorate-granting university	63
Comprehensive college	75
Liberal arts college	85

Source: Boyer, College: *The Undergraduate Experience in America*, Table 21.

TABLE VI
Faculty feelings about their own institution

Question: "In general, how do you feel about this institution?"

	It is a very good place for me %	It is a fairly good place for me %	It is not the place for me %
Research universities I	49	44	7
Research universities II	38	53	9
Doctoral universities I	33	56	11
Doctoral universities II	35	58	7
Comprehensive univ & colleges I	35	51	14
Comprehensive univ & colleges II	36	52	12
Liberal arts colleges I	56	37	7
Liberal arts colleges II	42	49	9
Two year colleges	47	45	8
TOTAL all institutions	41	49	10

Source: Clark, *The Academic Life*, Table 15

TABLE VII

Percentage of full-time regular faculty who were somewhat or very satisfied with various dimensions of their job, Fall 1987

	My job here overall %	Quality of colleagues in my department %	Institutional mission %
Public research	85	84	69
Private research	88	87	79
Public doctoral	82	80	65
Private doctoral	86	85	78
Public comprehensive	82	79	68
Private comprehensive	84	85	81
Liberal arts	85	85	85
Public two year	90	88	82
Other	85	93	76
TOTAL all institutions	85	84	74

Source: Russell et al, Faculty in Higher Education, Table 5.1

TABLE VII (continued)
Percentage of full-time regular faculty who were somewhat or very satisfied with various dimensions of their job, Fall 1987

	Spirit of cooperation among faculty %	Quality of leadership in my department %	Quality of faculty leadership %
Public research	70	69	68
Private research	73	70	73
Public doctoral	69	64	63
Private doctoral	67	66	76
Public comprehensive	60	65	61
Private comprehensive	69	74	63
Liberal arts	77	73	75
Public two year	75	75	75
Other	78	74	72
TOTAL all institutions	70	69	68

Source: Russell et al. *Faculty in Higher Education*, Table 5.1

TABLE VII (continued)
Percentage of full-time regular faculty who were somewhat or very satisfied with various dimensions of their job, Fall 1987

	Opportunities for advancement in rank	Availability of support services and equipment	Relationship between administration and faculty
	%	%	%
Public research	72	62	55
Private research	73	62	58
Public doctoral	69	57	56
Private doctoral	74	59	51
Public comprehensive	64	50	51
Private comprehensive	72	59	51
Liberal arts	74	67	62
Public two year	64	66	54
Other	74	51	55
TOTAL all institutions	69	60	54

Source: Russell et al, *Faculty in Higher Education*, Table 5.1

TABLE VIII
Student appraisal of their college professors and teaching

	Research university	Doctoral university	Comprehensive college & univ	Liberal arts college
"Overall, I am satisfied with the teaching I have received."	68%	68%	71%	85%
"There are professors at my college who take a personal interest in my academic progress."	52	56	61	73
"Professors at my college encourage students to discuss their feelings about important issues."	59	63	67	81
"On the whole, I trust the faculty here to look out for students' interests."	71	72	75	88
"There are professors at my college whom I feel free to turn to for advice on personal matters."	30	37	41	54

Source: Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, Table 25.

TABLE IX
Probable major field of study of 1989 college freshmen

	All U.S. Institutions %	Private four-year colleges Non-sectarian %	Protestant %	Catholic %
Arts and humanities	8.7	15.6	12.1	10.5
Social sciences	9.6	13.0	12.6	13.0
Biological sciences	3.7	4.8	5.4	4.9
Physical sciences	2.2	3.0	3.0	2.4
Total Arts and Sciences	24.2	36.4	33.1	30.8
Business	24.5	20.3	21.6	29.4
Education	9.2	6.9	12.7	9.9
Engineering	10.2	9.3	3.5	2.3
Other professional	12.7	8.6	12.0	12.0
Other subjects	12.3	10.2	9.4	8.0
Undecided	6.9	8.0	7.2	7.4

Source: Astin et al, "The American Freshman"

TABLE X
Higher education enrollments and participation rates by race and ethnicity

	Fall 1988 enrollment (1000s)	Percentage of total %	Percentage of high school graduates enrolled in college 18-24 yrs old %	25-34 yrs old %
White, non-Hispanic	10,283	78.8	38.7	7.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,130	8.7	28.0	7.4
Hispanic	680	5.2	30.9	8.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	497	3.8	na	na
Amer. Indian or Alaskan Native	93	0.7	na	na
Nonresident alien	361	2.8	na	na

Source: Schantz and Brown, *Trends in Racial/Ethnic Enrollment*, Tables 1 and 4

TABLE XI
Percent distribution of 18-24 year old population by race and ethnicity

	1985 %	1990 %	2000 %	2020 %	2050 %
White non-Hispanic	75	73	70	63	57
Spanish origin	8	9	11	15	19
Black	14	15	15	17	19
Other races	3	3	4	5	6
Total minority	25	27	30	37	43

Note: "Spanish origin" group includes all races of Spanish origin, leading to some double counting. "Total minority" subtracts "White non-Hispanic" from the total and is not affected by the double counting in the "Spanish origin" group.

Source: Spencer, *Projections of Hispanic Population: 1983-2080*, Table U

TABLE XII

Undergraduate student financial assistance provided directly by independent Liberal Arts Colleges I, 1970-71 and 1987-88 in constant 1987-88 dollars (thousands)

	1970-71	1987-88	Percent Change 1970-71 to 1987-88
Grants and scholarships			
Need based	$204,989	$356,240	73.8%
Non-need based/merit	3,225	49,610	1438.3
Other	4,512	14,582	223.2
Total	212,726	420,432	97.6
Work-Study			
Need based	21,163	21,507	1.6
Non-need based/merit	6,220	9,691	55.8
Other	1,683	1,859	10.5
Total	29,066	33,057	13.7
Loans			
Need based	16,548	19,438	17.5
Non-need based/merit	20	1,696	8380.0
Other	99	3,472	3407.0
Total	16,667	24,606	47.6
Other	0	1,604	
TOTAL	$258,459	$479,699	85.6%

Source: *Commitment to Access*, Table A-10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alsalam, Nabeel, ed., *The Condition of Education 1990, Volume 2: Postsecondary Education*, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 1990.

Anderson, Charles V. et al, 1989-90 Fact Book on Higher Education, American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1990

Astin, Alexander et al, "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1989," Cooperative Institutional Research Program, UCLA, 1989.

Astin, Alexander, *Four Critical Years*, Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Boyer, Ernest L., *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, Harper and Row, 1987.

Boyer, Ernest L., *Scholarship Reconsidered:* Priorities of the Professoriate, Princeton University Press, 1990.

Bowen, William G. and Julie Ann Sosa, *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply, 1987 to 2012*, Princeton University Press, 1989.

Breneman, David W., "Are We Losing Our Liberal Arts Colleges?" *College Board Review*, n.156, Summer 1990.

Cheney, Lynn, *Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right*, National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990.

Clark, Burton R., *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

A Commitment to Access, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1990.

Hanson, Katharine H. and Joel W. Meyerson,eds, *Higher Education in a Changing Economy*, American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1990.

Heller, Scott, "Stronger Push for Research on Liberal-Arts Campuses Brings Fears That Their Culture Is Threatened," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 5, 1990, pp. A11, 14-15.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Russell, Susan H. et al, *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988*, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 1990.

Nancy B. Schantz and Patricia Q. Brown, *Trends in Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Higher Education: Fall 1978 through Fall 1988*, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, June 1990.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

I have been a member of the Board of Trustees of Grinnell College since 1980, a tenure that exceeds the median (but not the average) of the entire governing board of the college. My assignments include chairing the Trustee-Faculty Relations Committee, a committee on which I have served since I joined the board; I am also a member of the Budget Committee and formerly a member of the Finance Committee. At the present time we are searching for a new president, a process that has led to considerable discussion about the future of the college--and has contributed to some of the ideas in this paper. In the last decade I have learned at least as much as I have contributed as a trustee.

My full-time position is Dean for Undergraduate Studies at the University of Maryland at College Park, a campus of almost 35,000 graduate and undergraduate students. My specific responsibilities include general education, honors, advising, equal opportunity programs, career development and placement, internships, and teaching improvement; my general goal is to serve as an advocate for the academic needs of students at Maryland. We have more undergraduate psychology majors at College Park than total students at Grinnell, a contrast that makes me very conscious of the realities of undergraduate education in different settings, at the same time that we are pursuing common goals of a liberal arts education. Working in a flagship land-grant university with a mission of research as well as teaching and service reminds me of the advantages of the clear focus of liberal arts colleges on teaching; my position also gives me firsthand experience with the disadvantages of the "publish or perish" model.

My academic appointment is in the School of Public Affairs at Maryland, where I currently teach a graduate seminar on the implementation of social policy. Before coming to College Park in 1988, I spent two years as a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, where my research looked at the unintended consequences of federal programs for higher education. Other professional experiences have included service as Associate Dean of the College at Brown University and senior positions at the Association of American Colleges. In addition, have written about and served as a consultant on curriculum development, innovations in undergraduate education, student financial aid, careers and the liberal arts, public and community service, governance, and higher education policy.

No personal statement for an academic audience is complete without a recitation of credentials. I received my BA from Grinnell with a major in history and a minor in English literature and my master's degree in American history from the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where I focused on the New Deal. I moved my time horizon forward to the present and acquired new analytical skills with my PhD in public policy from George Washington University. In addition, I have taken gradate courses in Chinese and Japanese history.

A special thank you to the faculty members, past and present college presidents, association executives, observers of higher education, and friends who contributed their ideas and insights to this paper.